United Nations A/C.4/58/SR.7

# General Assembly
Fifty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
18 February 2004
English
Original: Russian

## Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

**Summary record of the 7th meeting**
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 14 October 2003, at 10 a.m.

*Chairman*: Mr. Loedel ..... (Uruguay)

## Contents

Agenda item 81: Effects of atomic radiation *(continued)*

Agenda item 19: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*)*

Agenda item 87: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*)*

Agenda item 88: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

Agenda item 89: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*)*

Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)*

Agenda item 90: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

* Items which the Committee has decided to consider together.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

03-55584 (E)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.*

**Agenda item 81: Effects of atomic radiation** (*continued*) (A/58/46, A/C.4/58/L.5)

1. **Mr. Lopez Clemente** (Cuba) said that for many years the reports of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation had provided Member States with a source of valuable information on the effects of ionizing radiation on man and the environment. Because of their high scientific quality, the reports could be used as reference documents in adopting national and international norms for protecting the public from the effects of ionizing radiation. The current report provided extensive information on the epigenetic risks of ionizing radiation. That information would facilitate the adoption of preventive measures in order to alleviate the consequences of diseases caused by genetic and environmental factors.

2. His delegation attached great importance to the further strengthening of cooperation between the Scientific Committee and various organizations and agencies of the United Nations system, including the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Such cooperation could yield great benefits to mankind through the application of technical advances in various spheres, particularly health care and environmental protection. In conclusion, he confirmed his delegation's belief that broad, serious cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy was the only way to eliminate the potential danger of ionizing radiation.

3. **Mr. Linn Myaing** (Myanmar) said that his delegation associated itself with the statement to be made at the current meeting by the representative of Thailand on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). It welcomed the report of the Scientific Committee and commended the work of that Committee, which had contributed to a better understanding of the effects of radiation and the safe and systematic use of radioactive materials. However, his delegation found it regrettable that, because of funding problems, it had not been possible for the fifty-first regular session of the Scientific Committee to convene on the scheduled date, and hoped that the fifty-second session of the Committee would be held in Vienna in April 2004, as planned.

4. Myanmar was involved in the peaceful use of atomic energy in cooperation with IAEA. From 1976 to 2002, a total of US$ 7.5 million in assistance had been utilized in such areas as medicine, agriculture, nuclear technology and nuclear safety. An allocation of US$ 1.027 million was envisaged for 2003-2004.

5. The IAEA projects being carried on in Myanmar included the development of varieties of rice suitable for cultivation in drought-prone areas and saline lands, and the use of isotopic and non-isotopic techniques to evaluate locally available feed resources and to develop feed supplementation strategies for cattle used for milk and meat production. National centres for nuclear instrumentation maintenance had also been established.

6. Apart from successfully implementing national projects, not only under the IAEA technical cooperation programme but also through the use of national funding, his Government was actively participating in regional and interregional projects involving the peaceful use of atomic energy.

7. In 1998, an atomic energy law had been enacted in Myanmar, designed to develop the utilization of atomic energy and ensure its safety, formulate and implement measures for the prevention of atomic radiation effects on man and the environment and expand cooperation between local and foreign research institutes and organizations.

8. In conclusion, his delegation expressed the hope that the Scientific Committee would be able to continue with the implementation of its new programme of work and that information on the latest findings and developments in the field of atomic radiation would be disseminated to Member States so that the full potential of nuclear energy could be harnessed without causing harm to the environment or to mankind.

9. **Mr. Khakwani** (Pakistan) said that Pakistan fully supported the Scientific Committee's efforts to advance its new programme of work approved by the General Assembly, particularly with regard to exposures of workers and the public from various sources of radiation, sources-to-effects assessment for radon in homes and workplaces, epigenetic effects of exposure to ionizing radiation, health effects of the Chernobyl accident, and epidemiological studies and evaluations related to cancer and other diseases associated with radiation exposure.

10. Pakistan was reassured by the Scientific Committee's conclusion in 2002 that radiation exposure did not appear to cause hereditary effects in human beings, and urged the Committee to continue to study emerging data, particularly with regard to DNA mutations. With increased scientific research in molecular biology and genome sequencing, and epidemiological as well as technological advancements in related fields, that issue might need to be revisited in order to remove some of the remaining uncertainties and increase the degree of confidence in the findings of the Scientific Committee.

11. Pakistan continued to support the Scientific Committee's intention to continue its studies on the health effects of the Chernobyl accident and particularly appreciated the establishment of close collaboration with scientists from countries affected by that accident, especially Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine, whose unique expertise and knowledge could be valuable for the Scientific Committee's work.

12. **Mr. Chaimongkol** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the member States of ASEAN, said that while the advancement of nuclear technology and applications in medicine and industry could benefit mankind, there continued to be widespread concern about radiation exposure and radiation hazard. The ASEAN member States therefore greatly valued the work of the Scientific Committee in promoting better understanding of and protection from the perceived and actual risks of radiation.

13. The position of ASEAN on the military use of nuclear technology was well known. The 10 ASEAN member States had established the South East Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in order to keep the region free from nuclear weapons and protect it from environmental pollution and other hazards posed by radioactive wastes and other radioactive materials.

14. Following the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, and in view of the continuing threat of terrorism, there was growing concern about the possibility of nuclear weapons and nuclear-related materials falling into the hands of terrorists. There was thus a need to raise the levels of radiation safety and security associated with radioactive sources. In that regard, assistance should be rendered to States, at their request, to strengthen controls against illicit trafficking and to improve security of radioactive sources.

15. Since depleted uranium had both chemical and radiological toxicity, while also having peaceful applications, ASEAN encouraged the Scientific Committee, in cooperation with WHO, UNEP and IAEA, to conduct further studies of its utilization that would allow better health risk assessments to be made.

16. The ASEAN member States had been greatly concerned in 2002 that due to inadequate funding the Scientific Committee had been unable to meet as planned, and had been pleased to learn that in January 2003 the Committee had finally been able to resume its work. The ASEAN member States welcomed the report of the Scientific Committee and noted with appreciation that the Committee had been able to consider new information relevant to assessing sources of radiation and its effects.

17. ASEAN welcomed the recent decision taken by UNEP to provide budgetary support to the Scientific Committee and hoped that that would enable the Committee to meet regularly on an annual basis and disseminate information to all States in a timely manner on the latest developments and findings in the field of ionizing radiation.

18. **Mr. Gopinathan** (India) said that, as in previous years, his delegation was a sponsor of the resolution on the work of the Scientific Committee, which was being carried out on behalf of all the States Members of the United Nations. It was encouraging that at its fifty-first session, the Scientific Committee had reflected upon the official collaboration established with scientists of Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine and had begun to implement the new programme of work approved by the General Assembly, which included some new topics of contemporary interest.

19. The Scientific Committee was also continuing its discussions on the epidemiology of radiation and cancer. It was expected that new data would become available in the near future on the effects of radiation on atomic bomb survivors, persons living in the Techa river and the Semipalatinsk region and nuclear workers, and secondary malignancies in radiotherapy patients. The results of the study carried out in India on the incidence of cancer in the high background radiation area of Kerala and the programme on congenital malformation resulting from radiation exposure would also be of interest to the Committee,

and India called upon the Committee to take note of the data emerging therefrom.

20. India strongly advocated the need to increase the Scientific Committee's budget and hoped that adequate provision would be made for its work in the 2004-2005 biennium and subsequent biennia, without which the Committee's work would remain incomplete.

21. **Mr. Fallouh** (Syrian Arab Republic) commended the work of the Scientific Committee and expressed concern about inadequate funding of its activities.

22. The Syrian Arab Republic was pursuing a policy of using atomic energy for exclusively peaceful purposes, particularly in medicine, industry and agriculture, in the interests of development, environmental protection and socio-economic progress. In that regard it wished to caution some countries against attempts to impose harsh conditions on countries seeking to obtain nuclear technologies for peaceful purposes. At the same time, his Government called for the destruction of arsenals of nuclear weapons, which posed a threat to mankind. In 1969, the Syrian Arab Republic had become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In 2003, it had submitted to the Security Council a comprehensive draft resolution calling for the establishment of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. The Syrian Arab Republic, as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, called upon the international community to support its initiative.

23. The situation of Israel as the only country possessing an enormous arsenal of nuclear weapons which was not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and which was not subject to the safeguards regime was a destabilizing factor, especially in the context of the current tragic events in the Middle East.

24. In the absence of international control, the leakage of atomic radiation was a serious threat to neighbouring countries and the entire world. In order to eliminate that threat, the international community should put pressure on Israel to place all its nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards regime in accordance with paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 487 (1981).

25. At the most varied forums of the United Nations, the Syrian Arab Republic had drawn attention to the danger of radiation contamination caused by buried nuclear waste in some developed countries and in the open sea, which had adverse consequences for the population of coastal States and for the marine environment. Such actions were a violation of international law, particularly when they took place without monitoring by experts appointed by the specialized agencies.

26. Mankind could be protected from the dangerous consequences of the effects of atomic radiation only through international cooperation based on good will, resolve and the sincere concern of the international community.

27. **Mr. Takahashi** (Japan) said that his Government attached great importance to the activities of the Scientific Committee. Japan was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on the agenda item under consideration, since it believed that the Committee's activities were essential in a world that was increasingly reliant on nuclear technology; it hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

28. He wished to stress Japan's determination to use its wealth of experience for the greater benefit of mankind, as the only country in the world to have suffered the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons and as a country that had long been committed to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. In 2002 Japan had established a special advisory board for international activities on radiation protection which was concerned with various issues including those related to the activities of the Scientific Committee; the chairman of the board would assume the post of Chairman of the Scientific Committee in 2004, and Japan intended to contribute as actively as possible to the Committee's work.

29. **Mr. Awad** (Egypt) said that the Scientific Committee was undergoing a major crisis since it lacked the financial resources necessary for carrying out its work. Nevertheless, the serious approach and dedication of the Committee were highly commendable. His delegation stressed the importance of mobilizing the necessary political and financial support for the Committee so that it could continue its work.

30. The dangers associated with the increased use of atomic energy were numerous and varied. Egypt believed that it was necessary to continue the study of the effects of radiation exposure, collect and

disseminate reliable information to that end and evaluate the necessary safety and preventive measures. Egypt called upon the States Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in particular UNDP, IAEA and WHO, to continue to cooperate with the Scientific Committee. The use of nuclear technology for exclusively peaceful purposes had beneficial results, particularly in the areas of medicine, industry and agriculture. In that regard, Egypt reaffirmed the need to ensure freedom of access to nuclear technologies for developing countries without the imposition of discriminatory conditions or restrictions, in accordance with the provisions of article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

31. Furthermore, while reiterating its call for the establishment of a zone free from nuclear weapons and all other types of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, Egypt affirmed the need to place all nuclear facilities in the region under full-scale IAEA guarantees. In that connection, the presence of a nuclear reactor in the Negev desert in Israel, which was not subject to international monitoring or IAEA safeguards, posed a real threat to Egypt and other countries of the region.

32. In conclusion, his delegation was pleased to join the sponsors of the draft resolution on the item under consideration and hoped that the draft resolution would be supported by all delegations. Egypt supported the continued work of the Scientific Committee and was prepared to intensify all forms of cooperation with it.

33. **Mr. Leon Romeiro** (Brazil), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/58/L.5, said that Australia, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, France, Israel, India, Indonesia, Italy, Netherlands, Pakistan, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and South Africa had become sponsors, and expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

34. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed by the Secretariat that draft resolution A/C.4/58/L.5 had no programme budget implications.

35. *Draft resolution A/C.4/58/L.5 was adopted.*

36. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 81.

**Agenda item 19: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items)** (*continued*)

**Agenda item 87: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations** (*continued*)

**Agenda item 88: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories** (*continued*)

**Agenda item 89: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations** (*continued*)

**Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council** (*continued*)

**Agenda item 90: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories** (*continued*)

37. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed by the Secretariat that the draft resolutions and draft decision on the agenda items under consideration had no financial implications.

*Draft resolution I on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations, submitted under agenda item 87* (A/58/23 (Part III), chap. XII, sect. A)

38. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against*:

None.

*Abstaining*:

France, Israel, Qatar, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

39. *Draft resolution I was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

40. **Mr. Pisa** (United Kingdom) said that, as in previous years, the United Kingdom had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. It did not take issue with the main objective of the draft resolution and would continue to meet its obligations fully in respect of the United Kingdom Overseas Territories. However, it believed that the decision as to whether a Non-Self-Governing Territory had reached a level of self-government sufficient to relieve the administering Power of the obligation to submit information under Article 73 *e* of the Charter was ultimately for the Government of the Territory and the administering Power concerned, and not the General Assembly.

41. **Mr. Ballestero** (Costa Rica), **Ms. Kamboj** (India) and **Mr. Al-Otaibi** (Kuwait) said that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

42. **Mr. Al-Athba** (Qatar) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution, not to abstain.

*Draft resolution II on economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, submitted under agenda items 88 and 91* (A/58/23 (Part III), chap. XII, sect. B)

43. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against*:

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining*:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

44. *Draft resolution II was adopted by 135 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

45. **Mr. Estreme** (Argentina) said that the draft resolution just adopted should be implemented in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly on decolonization, in particular resolutions 2065 (XX) and 31/49 on the question of the Malvinas.

*Draft resolution III on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations, submitted under agenda items 89 and 12* (A/58/23 (Part III), chap. XII, sect. C)

46. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against*:

None.

*Abstaining*:

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

47. *Draft resolution III was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 45 abstentions.*

48. **Mr. Carnelos** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union reaffirmed its support for the efforts of the specialized agencies to assist Non-Self-Governing Territories in the humanitarian, technical and educational fields. At the same time, the mandates of those agencies must be scrupulously respected. The States members of the European Union had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution on offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, submitted under agenda item 90* (A/C.4/58/L.2)

49. **The Chairman** said that Indonesia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.4/58/L.2 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution on the question of Gibraltar, submitted under agenda item 19* (A/C.4/58/L.3)

51. *Draft resolution A/C.4/58/L.3 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution IV on the question of New Caledonia, submitted under agenda item 19* (A/58/23 (Part III), chap. XI, sect. D)

52. *Draft resolution IV was adopted.*

*Draft resolution V on the question of Tokelau, submitted under agenda item 19* (A/58/23 (Part III), chap. XII, sect. E)

53. *Draft resolution V was adopted.*

*Draft resolution VI on the questions of American Samoa, Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Guam, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Saint Helena, the Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands* (A/57/23 (Part III), chap. XIII, sect. F)

54. *Draft resolution VI was adopted.*

55. **Mr. Estreme** (Argentina) said that, as envisaged in the plan of action for the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, regional seminars on decolonization were held only in the Caribbean and the Pacific regions and at United Nations Headquarters. The phrase "and other venues" in the nineteenth preambular paragraph of section A of draft resolution VI was therefore inconsistent with the plan of action.

56. With regard to paragraph 2 of the same section, his Government affirmed its full support for the right of peoples to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970. At the same time, it should be clear that the reference to the principle of self-determination in that paragraph related only to the Territories named in the draft resolution. Both the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples recognized that there were Territories to which the principle did not apply since there was a dispute over sovereignty. For example, in the special colonial situation in the Malvinas, the principle of territorial integrity should apply, so as not to permit attempts to destroy the national unity of Argentina. That accorded with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and also its resolution 2065 (XX), and subsequent resolutions on the question adopted by the General Assembly and the Special Committee.

57. Argentina also had reservations about section B, part III, paragraph 3 of draft resolution VI. It rejected the participation of fictitious "colonial Powers" in relation to the Malvinas, South Georgia and the South Sandwich islands in the work of international forums at both the governmental and non-governmental levels and any documents circulated by them at such forums. Argentina also rejected the white paper referred to in section B, part V, paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. It reaffirmed its sovereignty over the Territories mentioned and their maritime areas.

58. **Mr. Oyarzun** (Spain) said that Spain had joined in the consensus on draft resolution VI and supported the principle of self-determination in relation to the Territories named in that resolution. At the same time it believed that the principle of self-determination was not the only principle which could be applied to the decolonization process of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In relation to some Territories, including Gibraltar, the principle of territorial integrity should apply in accordance with the doctrine laid down in various resolutions of the General Assembly.

59. **Mr. Pisa** (United Kingdom) said that, as in previous years, his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. That reflected its full support of the right of peoples to self-determination laid down in Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter and in paragraph 4 of the Millennium Declaration of the United Nations.

*Draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara, submitted under agenda item 19* (A/C.4/58/L.4)

60. **The Chairman** said that since consultations on the draft resolution were continuing, action would be taken at the next meeting.

61. **Ms. Kamboj** (India) said that over the past six or seven years such draft resolutions had been adopted by consensus. Since it was clear that no consensus would be reached at the current time, she proposed that the Committee should revert to the draft resolution after 48 hours, so that her delegation would have time to consult its capital.

62. **Mr. Suazo** (Honduras) said that he agreed with the representative of India. His delegation had always been in favour of consensus on the question under consideration. Honduras was participating in the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara and believed that agreement between the two parties was vitally important.

63. **Mr. Leon Romeiro** (Brazil), **Mr. Sinaga** (Indonesia), **Mr. Carnelos** (Italy), on behalf of the European Union, **Mr. Norzuhdy** (Malaysia), **Mr. Rudakov** (Russian Federation) and **Mr. Niang** (Senegal) said that they supported the proposal by the Indian delegation.

64. **Mr. Djacta** (Algeria), supported by **Mr. Musonda** (Zambia) said that consultations on the draft resolution

could still achieve a positive outcome. Considering that the draft resolution in its current form had become available to delegations only four or five days previously, it should be possible to take action on it at the next meeting. However, the final decision should rest with the Chairman.

65. **Mr. Bennouna** (Morocco) said that agreement should be reached on a 48-hour delay, which had been requested by important delegations, including the representatives of India, the Russian Federation and the European Union. Morocco had been awaiting a solution to the question under consideration for nearly 30 years and had always sought consensus, which for a number of years had been possible to reach. The achievement of consensus at the current time would depend on just one word. It was to be hoped that reason would prevail and consensus would once again be achieved.

66. **Mr. Baali** (Algeria) said that his delegation's proposal was as follows: if consultations led to the achievement of consensus, it would be possible to revert to the draft resolution at the next meeting, or within 24 hours. If that did not happen, the draft resolution should be put to the vote within 48 hours.

67. **Mr. Musonda** (Zambia) said that, in his view, no delegation in the room was more important than the others. The comment made by the representative of Morocco was therefore inappropriate. As to the proposal by the Algerian delegation, it seemed eminently reasonable.

68. **The Chairman** suggested that action on the draft resolution in its current wording should be deferred for 48 hours. Meanwhile consultations would continue, during which every effort would be made to work out a compromise text.

69. *It was so decided.*

70. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda items 87, 88, 89, 12 and 90.

*The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.*